



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,219	06/26/2003	Shigekazu Morikawa	030770	3714

38834 7590 09/25/2007
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER	
JONES, HEATHER RAE	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2621	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/25/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/606,219	MORIKAWA, SHIGEKAZU
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Heather R. Jones	2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 June 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 June 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/3/2007

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed June 28, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues on page 5, lines 18-19 that Walsh et al. discloses does not disclose a controller for controlling a decoding amount by the decoder. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Walsh et al. discloses in Fig. 11 and col. 9, lines 19-37 a controller (1102) that controls the selection and adjustment of encoding parameters used by the encoder (1104) based on the decode times fed back to the controller (1102) in order to ensure that decoding of the encoded frame is appropriate based on the capabilities of the known decoding system. By controlling the encoding parameters to maximize the capabilities of the decoding system the controller is indirectly controlling the decoding amount by the decoder. Furthermore, the claim language is broad enough to be interpreted as the controller indirectly controlling the decoding amount of the decoder as long as the controller is changing the encoding parameters in order to maximize the decoder. Therefore, Walsh et al. meets the claim limitations and the rejection is maintained.

The Applicant argues on page 7, lines 11-18 that Walsh et al. fails to disclose a plurality of encoded image components corresponding to a single still image are decoded by the decoder; decoding in the order of a lower frequency; controlling a decoding amount with a controller based on a fetching period of the

still image in the fetcher. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Walsh et al. discloses in Fig. 4 the different encoded image components corresponding to a single still image and that are later decoded in order of a lower frequency by the decoder (col. 7, line 62 – col. 8, line 11). Walsh et al. also discloses controlling the encoding parameters to maximize the capabilities of the decoding system the controller is indirectly controlling the decoding amount by the decoder. Furthermore, in col. 5, lines 44-47 Walsh et al. discloses displaying decoded video images in real time to monitor the capture and encoding of the video stream. Therefore, Walsh et al. meets the claim limitations and the rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Walsh et al. (U.S. Patent 5,952,943).

Regarding claim 1, Walsh et al. discloses a moving image reproducing apparatus that reproduces a plurality of encoded image signals generated by encoding, for each frequency component, a still image signals of respective screens forming a moving image signal, comprising: a decoder for decoding, in

the order of a lower frequency, a plurality of the encoded image signals corresponding to one screen (Figs. 8 and 9); a multiplexer (910) for multiplexing with each other a plurality of the decoded image signals decoded by the decoder so as to generate one screen of a decoded still image signal; and a controller (1102) for controlling a decoding amount by the decoder (col. 4, lines 32-54).

Regarding claim 2, Walsh et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 as well as further comprising a fetcher (210) for fetching the moving image signal in a real time (col. 4, lines 18-31), wherein the controller controls the decoding amount based on a fetching period of the still image signal forming the moving image signal (Fig. 11; col. 4, lines 32-54; col. 10, lines 58-66).

Regarding claim 3, Walsh et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 2 including the controller limits the decoding amount at a time that the fetching period does not satisfy a predetermined condition (Fig. 10 – steps 1010 and 1014).

Regarding claim 5, Walsh et al. discloses a moving image reproducing apparatus, comprising: a fetcher (210) for fetching a plurality of still images each of which has a plurality of encoded image components generated by encoding for each frequency component (col. 5, lines 30-32; col. 5, line 60 – col. 6, line 21); a decoder for decoding, in order of a lower frequency, the plurality of encoded image components corresponding to a single still image fetched by the fetcher (col. 4, lines 32-54; col. 7, line 62 – col. 8, line 59); a multiplexer (910) for

multiplexing with each other a plurality of decoded image components decoded by the decoder so as to generate a single decoded still image (col. 4, lines 32-54; col. 8, lines 40-59); a reproducer (204) for reproducing a moving image based on the decoded still image generated by the multiplexer; and a controller (1102) for controlling a decoding amount of the decoder based on the fetching period of the still image by the fetcher (col. 4, lines 32-54).

Regarding claim 6, Walsh et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 5 including that the controller includes a limiter for limiting the decoding amount at a time that the fetching period fails to satisfy a predetermined condition (Fig. 10 – steps 1010 and 1014).

Regarding claim 8, this is a method claim corresponding to the apparatus claim 5. Therefore, claim 8 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 5.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh et al. as applied to claims 1-3, 5, and 6 above, and further in view of Vetro et al. (U.S. Patent 6,519,288).

Regarding claim 4, Walsh et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1-3, but fails to disclose that the controller cancels a limitation of the decoding amount when a specific mode is manually selected.

Referring to the Vetro et al. reference, Vetro et al. discloses a decoder wherein the controller cancels a limitation of the decoding amount when a specific mode is manually selected (col. 8, lines 65-66).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the controller cancel a limitation of the decoding amount when a specific mode is manually selected by the user as disclosed by Vetro et al. combined with the reproducing apparatus disclosed by Walsh et al. in order to allow the user more control over the quality of the image they are viewing.

Regarding claim 7, Walsh et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1-3, but fails to disclose a canceller for canceling a limiting operation of the limiter when a specific mode is manually selected.

Referring to the Vetro et al. reference, Vetro et al. discloses a decoder wherein the controller cancels a limitation of the decoding amount when a specific mode is manually selected (col. 8, lines 65-66).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the controller cancel a limitation of the

Art Unit: 2621

decoding amount when a specific mode is manually selected by the user as disclosed by Vetro et al. combined with the reproducing apparatus disclosed by Walsh et al. in order to allow the user more control over the quality of the image they are viewing.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Heather R. Jones whose telephone number is 571-272-7368. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thurs.: 7:00 am - 4:30 pm; and every other Fri.: 7:00 am - 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on 571-272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Heather R Jones
Examiner
Art Unit 2621

HRJ
September 17, 2007



JOHN MILLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600